

5. Protection for protection's sake, believing that the tariff ought to be reduced to a strictly revenue basis, the heaviest burdens put on the luxuries and the lightest on the necessities of life.

The above may be said to embrace the vital issues now before the country, and about the position of the Alliance in regard to them there is no doubt.

How does Colonel Dockery stand in regard to them? We will consider them in order:

1. The Alliance is opposed to class legislation, and so is the Democratic party. With Colonel Dockery and his party, as the record shows, class legislation has been the constant practice. Look at the "protection" given to iron manufacturers, to cotton goods manufacturers, in a word, to manufacturers of all sorts of goods. Look at the favoritism to the bond-holders for twenty years past, at the favoritism to rich men generally as shown in the repeal of the income tax, a tax that the Alliance expressly demands shall be re-enacted. And yet Colonel Dockery pretends to be a great Alliance man—so much in love with it, its principles and its members, he says, that he could not find it in his heart to oppose one of them for any office he might desire. And yet he finds it in his heart to fight the whole Order upon one of its leading principles.

2. The Alliance opposes the tyranny and oppression of monopolies and trusts, and so does the Democratic party. In the last State platform the Democratic party expressly declared itself "against the monopolist and in favor of a just distribution of capital," and demanded "the enactment of laws that would bear equally upon all."

The national platform declares that "the interests of the people are betrayed when by unnecessary taxation trusts and combinations are permitted and fostered, which, while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition."

On the other hand, Mr. Blaine, the acknowledged leader of Colonel Dockery's party, openly declares that monopolies and trusts "are largely private affairs, with which neither Mr. Cleveland nor any private citizen has any particular right to interfere."

And yet Colonel Dockery, who voted for Mr. Blaine four years ago and would be his supporter again to-day if he was a candidate, parades himself before the people as a farmer and the special friend of farmers, and boasts of being a member of the Alliance!

Was the tyranny and oppressions of monopolies and trusts ever greater than it is to-day? Remember the coffee trust. It has not been twelve months since even well-to-do families felt obliged to stint themselves in coffee because the trust had raised the price till they were no longer able to pay it. Look at the sugar trust. Look at the cotton bagging trust. And yet we are told that neither the President nor any private citizen has any particular right to interfere with these monopolies and trusts. Perhaps, however, it will turn out that a Democratic Congress has a very particular right to interfere in the matter! We advise our Alliance friends to look well after Colonel Dockery and such members, if, indeed, they be *bona fide* members. Dangerous members they be who publicly oppose the vital principles of the Order to which they belong; that is to say, unless a house may be divided against itself without danger of falling.

3. The Alliance opposes excessive taxation. The Democratic party does so, too, and in its platforms declares that "unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation." How is it with the Radical party on this point? Under Radical legislation the government is to-day collecting some \$10,000,000 a month in the shape of taxes, more than is needed for its uses; but it must be collected, for the law is upon the statute book, placed there by a Radical Congress, and must be obeyed. If the collection of more than \$120,000,000 a year over and above the needs of the government be not excessive taxation, what amount can be called excessive? And yet the Radical party justifies the legislation, and so does Colonel Dockery; indeed, the Colonel is proud of it as "wise and beneficent legislation"; that is, if he is to be believed in what he says in his letter of acceptance.

And all this time Dockery is the farmer's friend and an humble, devoted member of the Alliance; that is to say, if he is to be believed! Of course, however, no man who boasts that the legislation which forces the collection of \$10,000,000 of taxes a month more than the government needs is wise and beneficent can be either an honest member of the Alliance or a truth-telling one.